



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/806,915 | 11/13/2001 | Christine Nicol | 2296.2320 | 7698 |

5514 7590 12/29/2004

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

FUBARA, BLESSING M

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1615

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/806,915

Applicant(s)

NICOL ET AL.

Examiner

Blessing M. Fubara

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7-18,20-25,28-30 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7-18,22-25,28-30 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner acknowledges receipt of request for continued examination and noncompliant amendment filed 09/01/04; compliant amendment filed in response to the communication of 09/10/04; and remarks filed 09/01/04 and 10/01/04. The remarks filed 10/01/04 in response to the communication of 09/10/04 are considered. Claims 1, 2, 7-18, 20-25, 28-30 and 34 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submission filed on 10/01/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The amendment to claims 1, 2, 11, 24, 25 and 34 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1, 2, 7-18, 22, 23, 28-30 and 34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winskill et al. (In Applied Animal Behavior Science, 1996, Vol. 48, pp 25-35) in view of Johnson et al. (In Equine Veterinary Journal, 1998, MARCH, Vol. 30 (2) 139-143) further in view of Pagan (In Australian Equine Veterinarian, Vol. 16 (4) Summer 1998).

Art Unit: 1615

Winskill discloses feeding horse with food composition in pelleted form and the food comprises 100 g protein, 200 g fiber (about 48.5%), 27.5 g oil (about 6.7%) and 85 g ash in addition to feeding the horse on concentrates and "timothy hay" (pages 27 and 28). The horses in Winskill exhibited stereotypic behavior and in the abstract in Winskill it is suggested that stereotypy may be caused by the horse's inability to express foraging behavior (lines 1 and 2 of the abstract). In Winskill's study, the horses expressed foraging behavior when fed the feed comprising fiber and oil (fat). Winskill teaches the composition of the instant claims except that Winskill does not teach a feed composition that contains an antacid.

Johnson discloses that sodium carbonate, an antacid, can be administered to stabled horses to neutralize acidity of hindgut and neutralizing the acidity lowers the incidence of stereotypic behavior (page 39, right column, first paragraph). Johnson recruits 4-10 year old male and female horses in the study where the horses were fed hay and concentrate in alternate week and one of the groups has the feed supplemented with Founderguard (page 140, left column, lines 10-20). The feed also contained crude fiber and crude protein (page 140, left column, lines 21-28). The horses were observed for grasping, wood chewing, cribbing and wind sucking (left column of page 140, lines 42 to the end). Cribbing and wind sucking are stereotypic behaviors. The result of the study is that Founderguard led to a reduction in abnormal behavior or stereotypic behavior by reducing acidosis of the hindgut. Since the horses were purchased and placed in the study, the horses have to have been weaned although the art is silent on that and examiners position is that the horses in Johnson's study encompasses the scope of recently weaned or weaning as recited in claim 14 or being weaned as recited in claim 22 or following weaning as recited in claim 23 or weaned as recited in claim 15. Regarding claim 13, examiner

Art Unit: 1615

takes the position that the stomach pH of the horse is controlled before or shortly after the horse develops stereotypic behavior since the result in Johnson states that administration of Founderguard reduces abnormal behavior by controlling hindgut acidosis. Regarding claim 12, examiner's position is that Johnson's study treated the horses before the stereotypic behavior is permanent or "fixed" as recited in said claim; the examiners position is supported by applicant's admitted prior art on page 7, lines 10-17 that an animal should be treated once the stereotypic behavior is observed before the stereotypy is fixed or permanent since the animal will continue to perform the stereotypic behavior once the behavior is fixed.

Johnson suggests a relationship between pH or acidity of the hindgut and behavioral responses (first and second paragraph, right column, last 2 lines, page 139) and specifically states that neutralizing acidity of the hindgut by administering sodium carbonate lowers the incidence of stereotypic behavior (last four lines of first paragraph, right column, page 139). A combined teaching of Winskill and Johnson is a method of feeding horses with a feed that comprises fat, fiber, protein, hay and where the feed is supplemented by Founderguard for treating stereotypic behavior in animals. Johnson and Winskill clearly teach the method of the instant claims except that the combined teaching of Johnson and Winskill does not teach administering proton pump inhibitor or histamine type-2 antagonist to control stomach pH, although Johnson suggests that neutralizing acidity of the hindgut with sodium carbonate lowers the incidence of stereotypic behavior.

Furthermore, Pagan teaches treating equine ulcers by neutralizing acidity with histamine type-2 antagonists (cimetidine and ranitidine) or proton pump inhibitors such as omeprazole or prostaglandin analogues or equine antacid such as the patented antacid Neigh-Lox (pages 160

Art Unit: 1615

and 161). Instant claim 11 is interpreted as a method of treatment or amelioration of stereotypy, the method comprising administering a composition that contains antacid to control stomach pH of an animal for examination purposes. The method is administration.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the composition of Winskill to treat stereotypic behavior and to incorporate antacid of Johnson or Pagan with the expectation of lowering or reducing the acidity of the hindgut. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to lower the incidence of stereotypic behavior and with the expectation that the histamine type-2 antagonists or proton pump inhibitor will reduce or inhibit gastric secretion leading to treatment of stereotypy or cribbing.

4. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (In Equine Veterinary Journal, 1998, MARCH, Vol. 30 (2) 139-143) and Winskill et al. (In Applied Animal Behavior Science, 1966, Vo. 48, pp 25-35) in view of Pagan (In Australian Equine Veterinarian, Vol. 16 (4) Summer 1998).

Winskill discloses feeding horse with food composition in pelleted form and the food comprises 100 g protein, 200 g fiber (about 48.5%), 27.5 g oil (about 6.7%) and 85 g ash in addition to feeding the horse on concentrates and "timothy hay" (pages 27 and 28). The horses in Winskill exhibited stereotypic behavior and in the abstract in Winskill it is suggested that stereotypy may be caused by the horse's inability to express foraging behavior (lines 1 and 2 of the abstract). In Winskill's study, the horses expressed foraging behavior when fed the feed comprising fiber and oil (fat).

Art Unit: 1615

Johnson suggests a relationship between pH or acidity of the hindgut and behavioral responses (first and second paragraph, right column, last 2 lines, page 139) and specifically states that neutralizing acidity of the hindgut by administering sodium carbonate lowers the incidence of stereotypic behavior (last four lines of first paragraph, right column, page 139).

But, Pagan teaches treating equine ulcers by neutralizing acidity with histamine type-2 antagonists (cimetidine and ranitidine) or proton pump inhibitors such as omeprazole or prostaglandin analogues or equine antacid such as the patented antacid Neigh-Lox and the above three classes of drugs inhibit gastric secretion (pages 160 and 161).

A combined teaching of Winskill and Johnson is a method of feeding horses with a feed that comprises fat, fiber, protein, hay and where the feed is supplemented by Founderguard for treating stereotypic behavior in animals and the Founderguard controls hindgut acidosis.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the combined teaching of Winskill, Pagan and Johnson. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the antacid of Johnson or Pagan in the feed of Winskill as feed horses with the modified composition with the expectation of reducing hindgut acidity or controlling the pH of the hindgut and thus minimizing the incidence of stereotypy in horses.

5. Claims 20 and 21 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 20 and 21 are directed to including fat and fiber and optionally antacid to the animals diet from birth or including the fiber diet in the feed of the lactating mother and the cited

Art Unit: 1615

prior art is silent on feeding lactating mothers and horses from birth with a diet of fat, fiber and antacid.

Response to Arguments

Applicants argue that a combination of Winskill and Johnson would not produce a composition that contains antacid since virginiamycin is not an antacid. Applicants' arguments filed 10/01/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because Johnson discloses administration of sodium carbonate, an antacid, to stabled horses to neutralize acidity of hindgut and neutralizing the acidity lowers the incidence of stereotypic behavior (page 39, right column, first paragraph). Sodium carbonate does not necessarily have to be administered to the hindgut to relieve hindgut acidity. It is noted that claim 1 recites stomach antacid and orally administering sodium carbonate delivers the sodium carbonate to the stomach and sodium carbonate is an oral antacid.

Applicants argue that Pagan is not related to treating stereotypic behavior because Pagan treats gastric ulcer in horses. In response, it is respectfully noted that the combination of Winskill and Pagan and Johnson is proper because Winskill administers to horses a feed of protein, fiber, oil, ash and "timothy hay" and after which observes foraging behavior in the horses and Pagan and Johnson are relied upon for relationship of antacid and behavior of the horses.

Applicants' argument with respect to Inoue is not addressed because the rejection of the claims over Inoue is not maintained. Inoue does not disclose a composition that contains an antacid and a combination of Johnson and Inoue may be proper to render the claims obvious and

Art Unit: 1615

that rejection carries about equal relevance as the rejection over Winskill, Pagan and Johnson.

Acidity is related to pH and controlling the pH is also controlling acidity or pH.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blessing M. Fubara whose telephone number is (571) 272-0594.

The examiner can normally be reached on 7 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. (Monday to Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Blessing Fubara
Patent Examiner
Tech. Center 1600

